



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/696,917	10/29/2003	Wallace T. Van Winkle	H0005096	8221
75	90 08/22/2006		EXAM	INER
Robert Desmond			LIEU, JULIE BICHNGOC	
Honeywell Inter	•		1000000	DARED NUMBER
Law Dept. AB2			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
P.O. Box 2245			2612	
Morristown, NJ 07962			DATE MAILED: 08/22/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/696,917	VAN WINKLE ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Julie Lieu	2612			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 De	e <u>cember 2005</u> .				
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-16 is/are pending in the approach 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-16 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction in the open control of the correction is objected to by the Example of the correction is objected to by the Example of the correction is objected to by the Example of the correction of the correc	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:				

- Application/Control Number: 10/696,917 Page 2

Art Unit: 2612

DETAILED ACTION

- 1. This Office action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed June 08, 06. Claims 1-
- 3, 12, and 13 have been amended. Claims 6, and 17-20 have been canceled.
- 2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. Claims 1-5, 7, 8, and 12-15are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaprelian (US Patent No. 4,857,895) in view of Kadwell et al. (US Patent No. 6,326,897).

Claim 1:

Kaprelian discloses a method for reducing false detects, comprising:

- a. emitting an infrared light beam from a primary emitter 24 to a primary monitor detector 26;
- b. detecting a portion of the first infrared light beam (fig. 4);
- c. measuring a first voltage value using a primary receive detector 26;
- d. detecting a portion of the second infrared light beam with a secondary receive detector 28;
- e. measuring the second voltage value.

· Application/Control Number: 10/696,917

Art Unit: 2612

Kaprelian also fails to disclose setting primary and secondary alarm flag alarm.

However, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, as technology advances, to use controller and a computer program to provide an alarm status as taught in Kadwell. One skilled in the art would have readily setting an alarm flag when smoke is detected from each detection provided by the detectors and provide an alarm when both detectors detect the alarm condition, that is, when the detection is confirmed by redundant detection.

Claim 2:

The secondary receive detector is directed at a line interconnecting the secondary emitter and the secondary monitor detector.

Claims 4-5:

The system in Kaprelian and Kadwell's determines a calibration level for the primary and secondary channels represent a scatter count of the air. The percent of smoke value of the air only present a choice in design. A skilled artisan would have readily known which percent value would be proper for the indication that an alarm situation exists.

Claims 7 and 8:

One skilled in the art would have readily recognized that, in the combined system of Kaprelian and Kadwell, the alarm situation should not be indicated if the redundant detector does not detect smoke and would disable the alarm flag.

Claim 11:

Kaprelian fails to disclose that first threshold value and the second threshold value is equal. Nonetheless, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art that these values should be equal since they are detecting the same amount of smoke.

Kaprelian discloses a method for using a smoke detection system comprising:

a. transmitting light from a first emitter 44 to a first monitor detector;

b. receiving a first portion of the light using a first receive detector 26;

c. determining a primary voltage by measuring the portion of the light received

from the first receive detector 28 and if the primary voltage is greater than a primary

threshold value;

d. receiving a second portion of the light using a second receive detector 28, the

second portion of the light having been scattered by the smoke, the secondary receive

detector is directed at a line interconnecting the secondary emitter and the secondary

monitor detector;

e. determining a secondary voltage by measuring the second portion of the light

received from the first receive detector 28 and if the primary voltage is greater than a

primary threshold value.

Kaprelian fails to disclose setting primary and secondary alarm flag alarm. However, it

would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, as technology advances, to use controller and a

computer program to provide an alarm status as taught in Kadwell. One skilled in the art would

have readily setting an alarm flag when smoke is detected from each detection provided by the

detectors and provide an alarm when both detectors detect the alarm condition, that is, when the

detection is confirmed by redundant detection.

<u>Claim 13:</u>

Application/Control Number: 10/696,917

Art Unit: 2612

In the Kaprelian system, light is transmitted from a second emitter 24 to a second monitor

detector.

Claims 14-15:

The percent of smoke value of the air only present a choice in design. A skilled artisan

would have readily known which percent value would be proper for the indication that an alarm

situation exists.

4. Claims 9-10 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Kaprelian (US Patent No. 4,857,895) in view of Kadwell et al. (US Patent No. 6,326,897) and

further in view of Solomon (US Patent No. 4,401,478).

Claims 9 and 16:

Neither Kaprelian nor Kadwell discloses a supervisory circuit. However, Solomon

teaches a supervisory circuit used for providing a maintenance fault signal. It would have been

obvious to one skilled in the art to apply this concept in the combined system of Kaprelian and

Kadwell system because it is conventional and desirable.

Claim 10:

It is inherent that since one channel in the modified system of Kaprelian and Kadwell

fails, the other one functions as a primary detector channel.

Applicant's Arguments

5. The Applicant has presented the following arguments:

Page 5

The Applicant has argued that Kaprelian and Kadwell make no mention of a second receive detector.

Response to Applicant's Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

It is submitted that the second photodiode 28 is the second receive detector as stated in the rejection. Kadwell has been used to show the application of a computer processing device to set smoke alarm flags. Therefore, the Applicant's arguments are not considered persuasive.

For the above reasons, the rejection is maintained.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Julie Lieu whose telephone number is 571-272-2978. The examiner can normally be reached on MaxiFlex.

. Application/Control Number: 10/696,917

Art Unit: 2612

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Horabik can be reached on 571-272-3068. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Julie Lieu

Primary Examiner Art Unit 2612

Page 7

Aug. 10, 06